



Robert V. Prongay
rprongay@glancylaw.com
1925 Century Park East, Suite 2100
Los Angeles, CA 90067
T: 310.201.9150

April 30, 2020

VIA ECF

Hon. Lorna G. Schofield
United States District Court
Southern District of New York
500 Pearl Street
New York, New York 10007
E-Mail: SchofieldNYSDChambers@nysd.uscourts.gov

Re: *Stein v. Eagle Bancorp, Inc. et al*, Case No. 1:19-cv-06873-LGS

Dear Judge Schofield:

Plaintiffs respectfully submit this letter to request permission to file a 35 page opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss (Dkt. No. 45), which Plaintiffs anticipate filing on May 15, 2020, pursuant to the Court's order dated March 16, 2020 (Dkt. No. 43). This request is made pursuant to Rule III.B.1 of Your Honor's Individual Rules, which limits oppositions to motions to 25 pages, unless prior permission has been granted.

Plaintiffs believe that an extension of the Court's normal page limits is warranted by a number of factors, including (1) this case is a securities fraud class action subject to the pleading standards of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995; (2) this case has a relatively complex fact pattern, and Plaintiffs' allegations are based in part on the facts underlying a series of separate lawsuits involving one of the Defendants, presenting a "case within a case" aspect to Plaintiffs' allegations;¹ (3) the Complaint alleges multiple categories of false and misleading statements, each of which is disputed by Defendants; (4) the Complaint alleges scheme liability claims separate from its misstatement claims; (5) Plaintiffs must address the issue of scienter separately as to five different Individual Defendants; and (6) Defendants also challenge the element of loss causation.

¹ See, e.g., Complaint (Dkt. No. 37) at ¶¶105-24, 240-42; Dkt. Nos. 37-1-37-2 (complaint and exhibits from *Rahbar v. Paul, et al.*, CL 2017-02133 (Va. Cir. Ct., Fairfax, Feb. 10, 2017)); Dkt. No. 37-3 (complaint from *MRP UO Partners, LLC, et al. v. MakeOffices, LLC, et al.*, CL 2017-00817 (Va. Cir. Ct., Fairfax, Jan. 18, 2017)).

Hon. Lorna G. Schofield

April 30, 2020

Page 2

Defendants do not object to Plaintiffs' request, so long as Defendants receive a reciprocal 10 page extension for their reply brief. Accordingly, Plaintiffs request that the Court permit Plaintiffs to file a brief that is no longer than 35 pages in opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss and permit Defendants to file a brief that is no longer than 20 pages in reply.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Robert V. Prongay

Robert V. Prongay

cc: All counsel of record